

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 213

July 23, 1996, 10:00 am
Page S-July 23, 1996, 10:00 am Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM RECONCILIATION/School Food Program Start-Up Grants

SUBJECT: Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 . . . S. 1956. Lugar motion to table the Harkin amendment No. 4916.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 56-43

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1956, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, will enact major welfare reforms. The Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program will be replaced with a new Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant to the States. The TANF block grant will be capped through 2001. Time limits will be placed on individuals receiving TANF benefits. Overall, the growth in non-Medicaid welfare spending will be slowed to 4.3 percent annually. The bill originally included major Medicaid reforms, but most of those provisions were stricken when the bill was reported. Without those Medicaid reforms, welfare spending will still be reduced by \$61.4 billion over 6 years.

The Harkin amendment would strike section 1253. That section will eliminate a program that gives grants to local school districts for beginning or expanding school breakfast programs and summer food programs. The amendment would not provide any means of offsetting its \$112 million cost over 6 years.

Following debate, Senator Lugar moved to table the Harkin amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

This program to provide seed capital to schools for starting school breakfast and summer food programs has outlived its usefulness, because 4 out of 5 students now attend schools that have such programs. In the last 2 years, only 48 schools in the entire country have even asked for start-up money. In a rare display of unanimity, this bill, the President's proposed bill, and the Daschle substitute amendment all have proposed doing away with this program. Clearly it is not a high priority. Certainly some very marginal benefits would be gained by continuing funding, but those benefits would come at a cost of \$112 million over the next 6 years. If

(See other side)

YEAS (56)			NAYS (43)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (52 or 100%)		Democrats (4 or 9%)	Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (43 or 91%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Biden		Akaka	Johnston	Kassebaum- ⁴	
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Breaux		Baucus	Kennedy		
Bennett	Inhofe	Byrd		Bingaman	Kerrey		
Bond	Jeffords	Nunn		Boxer	Kerry		
Brown	Kempthorne			Bradley	Kohl		
Burns	Kyl			Bryan	Lautenberg		
Campbell	Lott			Bumpers	Leahy		
Chafee	Lugar			Conrad	Levin		
Coats	Mack			Daschle	Lieberman		
Cochran	McCain			Dodd	Mikulski		
Cohen	McConnell			Dorgan	Moseley-Braun		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Exon	Moynihan		
Craig	Nickles			Feingold	Murray		
D'Amato	Pressler			Feinstein	Pell		
DeWine	Roth			Ford	Pryor		
Domenici	Santorum			Glenn	Reid		
Faircloth	Shelby			Graham	Robb		
Frahm	Simpson			Harkin	Rockefeller		
Frist	Smith			Heflin	Sarbanes		
Gorton	Snowe			Hollings	Simon		
Gramm	Specter			Inouye	Wellstone		
Grams	Stevens				Wyden		
Grassley	Thomas						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Hatfield	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

we were to retain this program, then we would have to come up with \$112 million in savings elsewhere within the agricultural function in order to meet the reconciliation target. Some Senators have wrongly assumed that the Harkin amendment does not need offsets because we achieve more than enough in savings this year. However, those savings are necessary in order to meet a specific spending target in the last year of this bill. Without an offset now, the final year spending numbers will be too high. The Harkin amendment is about priorities. Either we cut funding for this outdated program that every welfare reform proposal to date has proposed eliminating, or we cut funding elsewhere. If our colleagues could suggest an area of lower priority to cut, we would be happy to consider it, but in the absence of any such responsible proposal we urge our colleagues to table the Harkin amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Harkin amendment would provide for the continuation of a very small yet very vital program that provides assistance to start and to expand school breakfast and summer food programs for low-income children. This program is directly related to education. If kids come to school hungry and they stay hungry, they cannot study and they cannot learn. They end up failing school and often turn to crime or end up on welfare. An offset is not needed for this amendment because the Agriculture Committee has come up with \$570 million more in savings than needed, and the CBO estimates that this program would only cost \$112 million over the next 6 years. Only half of the low income children in America participate in the school breakfast program, and less than 20 percent receive summer meals. The need is great and the cost is minimal; the Harkin amendment should not be tabled.